

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JON-ERIK ROOSEVELT BOLDS, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

LUEVANOS, et al.,,

Defendants.

No. 1:21-cv-01668-ADA-SAB (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST
FOR STATUS AS MOOT

(ECF No. 60)

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On September 13, 2023, Plaintiff filed a request for status and confirmation of the court deadlines. (ECF No. 60.) In his request, Plaintiff states that he asked for the “status and due date that [he] has to return the courts or defendants requested documents.” (Id. at 1.) Plaintiff is advised that on September 12, 2023, the Court granted his motion for an extension of time to file a response to Defendants’ discovery requests, and the order was served on Plaintiff at his address of record. (ECF No. 59.) As advised in the Court’s November 16, 2021, litigant letter, “[d]ue to the large number of civil actions pending before the court, THE CLERK IS UNABLE TO RESPOND IN WRITING TO INDIVIDUAL INQUIRES REGARDING THE STATUS OF YOUR CASE. As long as you keep the court apprised of your current address, you will receive all court decisions which might affect the status of your case.” (ECF No. 3-1 at 2.) Plaintiff is

1 advised that the Court will not file and/or respond to requests for status of the case such as the
2 current filing. Therefore, Plaintiff should refrain from filing requests as to the status and/or
3 interpretation of court orders. Accordingly, because the Court granted Plaintiff's request for an
4 extension of time to respond to Defendants' discovery requests, Plaintiff's request for the status
5 of the case is denied as moot.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: September 14, 2023


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE